

applied to Claim 3, and further in view of JP 09319501 A to Fumihiko et al. (herein "Fumihiko").

Addressing now the above-noted rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Briefly recapitulating, the claims as currently written are directed to a coordinate inputting/detecting apparatus such as shown in Figure 1 in the present specification, as a non-limiting example.

The applicants of the present invention have recognized drawbacks in that background coordinate detecting systems cannot always accurately detect the proper instance at which a pointer separates from a touch panel, such as shown for example in Figure 20 in the present specification. As shown in Figure 20 in the present specification, a pointer, in this case a user's finger 202, actually separates from a touch panel at the point P, but often a trailing line 204 results because the user's finger is not detected as separating from the touch panel until the point P'.

One way in which the present invention addresses such a drawback is to initially detect a designating device when an optical detection signal exceeds a first threshold value, and then to set a second threshold value higher than the first threshold value to recognize the coordinates of the position in the coordinate inputting/detecting area. Such an operation improves the detection at which a designating device leaves a coordinate inputting/detecting apparatus.

Such a feature as noted above is reflected in the claims and differs from the teachings in the applied art to Blue in view of Van Marcke.

First, the outstanding Office Action recognizes a deficiency in Blue in Blue not disclosing setting the “second threshold value”.¹

To overcome the recognized deficiencies in Blue the outstanding Office Action cites the teachings in Van Marcke. However, the teachings in Van Marcke appear to have been misconstrued and do not in fact teach the same type of thresholding operation as in the claimed invention. Van Marcke discloses using two different thresholds in a proximity detecting device, but the thresholds used in Van Marcke are not directed to the claimed features, and even if combined with the teachings in Blue would not meet the claim limitations.

More specifically, in the claims as currently written the first and second thresholds are utilized to detect different types of events, which clearly differs from the teachings in Van Marcke in which the pair of thresholds are always utilized when a hand interrupts and reflects a light emitted from a light-emitting element to compare an amount of light reflected and received by a photoreceptor, to vary an amount of the light emitted from the light-emitting element in accordance with the distance between the hand and the photoreceptor.

In contrast to Van Marcke in which the pair of thresholds are always utilized to detect the same type of event, the first and second thresholds recited in the claims are utilized to detect different events. As recited in Claim 1 the first threshold value is utilized to determine “whether or not the designating device has been inserted into the predetermined range of the coordinate inputting/detecting area”, and the second threshold is utilized “in recognizing the coordinates of the position in the coordinate inputting/detecting area”. The other independent claims recite similar limitations. Thus, in the claims as currently written one threshold is utilized in coordinate detection and the other threshold is utilized for a designating device

¹Office Action of October 17, 2002, the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3.

detection, which are clearly different events. As noted above, using two thresholds to detect such two different events differs from the teachings in Van Marcke.

In such ways, even if the teachings of Van Marcke were combined with those of Blue, all the claim limitations would not be met because neither Blue nor Van Marcke discloses or suggests utilizing a second threshold to detect a different type of event at a higher level than a first threshold. The claims as currently written are directed to a problem resolving device capable of suppressing a trailing line, which generally appears when a designating device separates from the coordinate inputting/detecting apparatus.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that, in contrast to the position taken in the outstanding Office Action, Van Marcke does not show in the "Continuous threshold adjustable proximity detecting device", such as in Figure 6, how to adjust a second threshold value to be greater than the first threshold value. It is respectfully submitted that is the case because in Van Marcke the first and second thresholds are fixed, and the objective of the device of Van Marcke is to adjust an amount of the light emitted from a light-emitting element.

In such ways, the invention as recited in the currently pending claims is believed to clearly distinguish over the combination of teachings in Blue in view of Van Marcke.

Moreover, no teachings in Fumihiko are believed to overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Blue in view of Van Marcke.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Attorney of Record
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423



22850

(703) 413-3000
Fax #: (703)413-2220
GJM:SNS/smi

I:\atty\SNS\196124US-af.wpd